Northern District of California

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED S	TATES DISTRICT COURT
7		
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	GARRED F. NORMAN,	
11	Plaintiff,	No. C 22-07648 WHA
12	v.	
13	FEDERAL BUREAU OF	ORDER DISMISSING CASE AND
14	INVESTIGATION, et al.,	DENYING MOTIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION
	Defendants.	MECOTOIDEM TION

In its previous order, the Court reiterated that plaintiff's failure to pay the \$400.00 filing fee by January 18, 2023, would result in dismissal of the above-captioned action without prejudice (see Dkt. No. 12; see also Dkt. No. 5). It is now January 19, 2023, and plaintiff has still not paid. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

Plaintiff's motions for reconsideration of the orders denying him leave to proceed in forma pauperis and denying his motion to appoint counsel are **DENIED**. Our court of appeals has held that "[m]otions for reconsideration may properly be denied where the motion fails to state new law or facts." In re Agric. Rsch. & Tech. Grp., Inc., 916 F.2d 528, 542 (9th Cir. 1990). It has also held that leave to proceed in forma pauperis may be denied at the outset if it appears on the face of the complaint that the action is frivolous, and that appointment of counsel for indigent civil litigants is limited to exceptional circumstances. Tripati v. First Nat. Bank & Tr., 821 F.2d 1368, 1370 (9th Cir. 1987); Aldabe v. Aldabe, 616 F.2d 1089, 1093 (9th

Case 3:22-cv-07648-WHA Document 15 Filed 01/19/23 Page 2 of 2

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28

United States District Court Northern District of California 1

2

Cir. 1980). Plaintiff offers no new law or facts to justify reconsideration. Moreover, the Cour	t
remains convinced that this action is frivolous and that there are no exceptional circumstances	
here. See Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986).	

For the foregoing reasons, this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice. Plaintiff is advised that he may appeal this matter to the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit within sixty days of the entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(B).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 19, 2023.